

REMARKS

In the Office Action dependent claims 10 and 11 were considered to be allowable. Claim 10 depended on claim 8 which in turn depended on claim 1.

New claim 19 includes all of the limitation in the body of allowed claims 10, 8 and 1, with the claim being re-organized to more logically present the entire system.

All of the other remaining claims are dependent on allowable claim 19, and accordingly should be considered allowable with it.

In view of the foregoing amendment, an early Notice of Allowance is clearly in order, and is solicited.

It is noted that the Office Action was mailed on June 12, 2003, and this response is being filed two months late. Accordingly, we authorize charging the two month late fee, and any other fees which may be due for a small entity and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 16-2230.

In the event that this patent application is not considered to be entirely in condition for allowance, it would be appreciated if the Examiner would grant a telephone interview. Applicant's attorney would prefer a personal interview with the Examiner, but is located in Los Angeles so that a personal interview is not practical. Accordingly, a comparable telephone interview would be appreciated if the application is not considered allowable. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan C. Rose, Reg. 17,047
Attorney for Applicant

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY LLP
233 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Telephone: 310/319-5456
Facsimile: 310/319-3508